



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/414,091	10/07/1999	STAVROS C. MANOLAGAS	D6210	2781

7590 10/21/2003

SHERRY M. KNOWLES, ESQ.
KING & SPALDING
191 PEACHTREE STREET
ATLANTA, GA 30303-1763

EXAMINER

CRIARES, THEODORE J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

22

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/414,091

Applicant(s)

MANOLAGAS ET AL.

Examiner

Theodore J. Criares

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13-37, 46 and 47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 13-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 47 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1, 2, 9 and 46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10/07/99 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4, 7, 12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

CLAIMS 1-4,6, 7, 9, 10, 13-37, 46 AND 47 ARE
PRESENTED FOR EXAMINATION

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1, 2, 9, 46 and 47 in Paper No. 21 is acknowledged.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The examination of the claims were limited to the elected compounds in claims 46 and 47 with the following results.

Claims 3, 4,6, 7, 9, 10 and 13-37 are withdrawn from consideration since they are not encompassed within the compounds having the activity claimed by applicants. The remaining claims read upon compounds which are classified throughout subclasses of class 514 and would be an undue burden on the examiner. For example, estradiols are classified in class 514 subclass 171+ and raloxifene is classified in class 514, subclass 646.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1617

Claims 1, 2, 9 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants teach an assay and claim an assay to determine compounds which can be used to treat bone diseases which will increase bone mass by at least 10%. However, only three compounds are listed in the specification at page 47, lines 12-15. It would require an undue experimentation to determine the compound to be effective and thereafter test the assayed compound to determine if it would increase the bone mass by 10%. These requirements would cause an undue burden on one of ordinary skill in the art to determine the compounds to be utilized in the practice of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 1617

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 9 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpkins et al. (6,319,914).

Simpkins et al. teach at column 2, lines 59-64 that estratriene-3-ol has a high cytoprotective capability and column 6, lines 44-63 (see lines 61-61) that the applicants' claimed estratriene-3-ol has the capability of treating osteoporosis.

The difference between applicants' claims and Simpkins et al is the percentage increase in bone mass. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use applicants claims compounds as claimed in claim 46 to treat osteoporosis (a bone disorder which weakens bone) since the teaching in the reference indicates that estratriene-3-ol is a potent cytoprotective agent.

The test of obviousness is "whether the teachings of the prior art, taken as a whole, would have made obvious the claimed invention." In re Gorman, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ 2d 1885, (Fed. Cir. 1991). In view of the above rejection it is deemed that the evidence presented has established a prima facie case of obviousness. is presented.

Claim 47 is allowed.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theodore J. Criares whose telephone number is 308-

Art Unit: 1617

4607. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 A.M. to 5:00P.M. Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 305-1877. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-1235.



Theodore J. Criares
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617

9/20/03
tjc